

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/782,004	Applicant(s) DAHIYAT ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael Borin	Art Unit 1631	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Michael Borin. (3) John R. Desjarlais.
 (2) Joyce L. Morrison. (4) Kenton Abel.

Date of Interview: 24 May 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Applicant demonstrated essential features of the claimed subject matter.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Utility rejection was discussed; it was concluded that the claims will be amended to more specific embodiments having demonstrable utility and enablement. Art rejections of record were discussed and possible amendments to the claims as well as submission of Declaration showing unexpected results was discussed.

It was agreed that since applicant has already submitted a response to outstanding Office action, the next Office action will be made non-final and will address mostly issues related to art rejections; subsequent changes in claim language will be addressing utility issue as well as remaining issues related to art rejections. .